DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 143 581 SO 010 254

TITLE	Women Appointed to State Boards and Commissions.
INSTITUTION	National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, Washington, D.C.; Rutgers, The State Univ., New Brunswick, N.J. Center for the American Woman and Politics.
PUB DATE	Feb 76
NOTE	43p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center for the American Woman & Politics, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901 ($3.00, paper cover)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Business Administration; Certification; Data Analysis; Economic Development; Education; Environment; *Females; Health; Industry; Labor Economics; *Percentage; Professional Personnel; Ratios (Mathematics); Research Needs; Sex Stereotypes; *State Government; *State Officials; Transportation; Utilities; Welfare

ABSTRACT

The report analyzed the average proportions of women on 2,134 state boards and commissions in ten areas of state government. Data were collected in 1975 at the request of the Women in Power Committee of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year. The ten functional areas of government were business regulation, economic and industrial development, education, environmental protection, health, labor, professional and occupational licensing, public utilities, transportation, and welfare. After data from various sources were classified, it was found that the average proportion of women on a board or commission is 15%. This does not seem to be influenced by state characteristics such as population, regional location, political climate, or participation of women in other state offices. There are high concentrations of women in areas of health, education, and welfare, but not in labor, public utilities, environmental protection, or transportation. It is unknown if this discrepancy relates to women's preferences or to sex-role stereotyping among those making appointments. Among the report's seven recommendations are development of state-maintained talent banks of qualified women and foundation-supported research on the nature of appointive processes. (Author/AV)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED143581

WOMEN APPOINTED TO STATE BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathy Stanwick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS.

A Report

Prepared For
Women in Power Committee
National Commission
On The Observance Of
International Women's Year, 1975

Prepared By
Center for the American Woman and Politics (CAWP)
Eagleton Institute of Politics
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901

Kathy Stanwick, Project Director
Marilyn Johnson, Director of Research

5Ø010254

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS AND PROBLEMS OF DATA GATHERING	4
FINDINGS	8
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	14
FOOTNOTES	20
TECHNICAL NOTES	21
TABULATIONS	28

WOMEN APPOINTED TO STATE BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

INTRODUCTION

This report describes the first systematic effort to document the extent of women's place on appointive governing bodies. For documentation, it relies on a count of the proportions of women currently serving on selected boards and commissions in the states. The following pages contain the only national data collected to date about the participation of women in these appointive offices.

Perhaps because of the formidable difficulties of obtaining relevant data, or perhaps because the public and the media as well as policymakers and researchers have directed their initial questions about women in politics to elective office, heretofore not even the most basic questions about women in state appointive office have been asked or answered on a national basis. What proportions of appointive positions are filled by women? On which types of boards and commissions are women likely to be found in larger or smaller proportions? Is the representation of women on state boards and commissions associated with the proportion of state elective offices filled by women? To what degree are there state and regional variations in the proportions of women serving? Does the political party of a state's governor affect the proportions of women found serving on appointive boards and commissio ? These are some of the questions guiding the research

reported in the following pages.

The analysis of women appointed to state boards and commissions has been conducted for the Women in Power Committee of the National Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year, 1975. At the Committee's request, CAWP undertook this research to focus attention on the extent to which opportunities exist for the utilization of women's talents and skills in state government.

The absence of knowledge about the roles women play on state boards and commissions occurs within a more general informational vacuum concerning the process by which citizens come to share in the decision-making activities of their government through appointive office. There is at present almost no published knowledge about the nature, scope and importance of appointed boards and commissions in state government. Furthermore, there is no body of organized and available information about how the appointive process operates in filling vacancies. Although this report documents sharply the paucity of women in these appointive offices, future strategies for the remedy of deficiencies may be strengthened by broad investigation of the structure and functioning of state appointive positions and by inquiry into the process by which appointments are made.

What follows is an analysis, from data collected in November and December 1975, of the average proportions of women on 2134 boards and commissions in ten areas

of state government. The first section describes the methods utilized in collecting the data. The second section presents the research findings. The final section states briefly our conclusions and relates these conclusions to recommendations for increasing the proportions and roles of women serving on state boards and commissions. Supporting tabulations and technical notes appear at the end of the report.

METHODS AND PROBLEMS OF DATA GATHERING

Choosing the Areas of Investigation

Titles of boards and commissions as well as their respective areas of jurisdiction vary widely from state to state. This variation prohibits meaningful comparison of individual boards and commissions. In order to achieve a uniform classification system for all state boards and commissions, categories describing selected functional areas have been utilized. Functional areas allow boards and commissions to be grouped according to categories of governmental activity rather than solely by similarity in name.

We selected ten major functional areas of government and have included in the analysis all state boards and commissions judged to fall within the designated areas. Given limited resources of time and money, it is impossible to examine every board or commission within all the states. Areas were chosen to supply information about the concentration of women serving over a broad spectrum of appointive positions. The ten functional areas were chosen to include those likely to contain higher and lower proportions of women members.

The predictions about the relative concentrations of women in different types of appointive office are consistent with previous research on the distribution of committee assignments among women in elective office (see Table 35, p. xlv of

Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis, R.R. Bowker, forthcoming February, 1976).

The ten functional areas selected vary in their hypothesized concentrations of women as follows:

Predicted areas of higher concentration of women

Education
Health
Welfare of children, youth or the aged

Predicted areas of lower concentration of women

Business regulation
Industrial and economic development
Public utilities
Transportation

No prediction regarding concentration of women

Environmental protection
Labor
Professional and occupational licensing boards (It was hypothesized that this concentration will depend on the sex composition of workers in the relevant occupation.)

All boards and commissions within each state were inspected. Those belonging to one of the ten designated areas were selected for inclusion and then classified. We then counted the total number of members and the number of female members on each board or commission. In order to compare proportions of women on boards commissions across states and within the context of existing demographic and

political conditions, we have utilized information on individual states. This information includes: region of the country,[1] 1970 population of the state,[2] 1970 population density of the state,[3] political party of the current governor,[4] the number of years since 1950 the governorship has been held by one political party,[5] proportion of women in the state legislature in 1975,[6] number of women serving at the cabinet level in the state executive in 1975.[7] A comparison of this selected information enables us to identify the pattern of variation, nationwide, in the representation of women on state boards and commissions.

Classification of Data

Among the procedures followed to insure uniformity in coding the information for computer processing and analysis, several special rules deserve mention. In counting the total members on a board or commission, only positions actually occupied are included in the count, and vacancies are eliminated. Ex officio members, usually elected officials without voting power, were not included in the membership count. In most cases, names not clearly identifying the gender of a member were validated as male or female through letters and telephone calls. In a few cases (fewer than 1%), the decision was made randomly to count a name as either male or female. Finally, boards or commissions which could not clearly be coded into a single functional area are omitted from the analysis.

Sources of Data on Boards and Commissions

Although demographic and political data for the states are often readily available

in published form, specific information on state boards and commissions is far more difficult to obtain. Indeed, an important discovery of our research is the fact that many states lack a systematic method of assembling and disseminating knowledge about members of boards and commissions. Information may exist piecemeal in various state offices. State officials are often uninformed about the availability or location of such records.

Despite barriers encountered in collecting the requisite information, we have analyzed more than 2000 boards and commissions in 39 states. Essential data were unavailable during the period of research from seven states: Colorado, Massachusetts, Missouri, Montana, New Mexico, Pennsylvania and Tennessee. Four states supplied partial information insufficient for inclusion of that state in the analysis: Alabama, Kentucky, Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Sources vary considerably among those states from which information has been obtained. (See Technical Note A for a state-by-state summary of sources.) Many lists came from "blue books", state directories or from legislative affairs agencies or similar governmental offices. Other lists were obtained because someone in a state office was willing to compile the information especially for this study. In the majority of cases, 1975 membership lists were used. In the remainder of the cases, we used earlier lists but none prior to 1973. (For dates of sources used see Technical Note A.)

FINDINGS

The results of our analysis are based on 2134 boards and commissions in 39 states. As described in the preceding section, the analysis includes all boards and commissions in ten functional areas of government: business regulation, economic and industrial development, education, environmental protection, health, labor, professional and occupational licensing, public utilities, transportation and welfare.

The ten functional areas selected for this analysis do not include all areas of governmental activity for which boards and commissions exist. Nevertheless, our selection would appear to be closely representative of the totality. In November, 1975, Governor Ella T. Grasso of Connecticut, co-chairwoman of the Committee on Power, asked the governor's office of each state to indicate the percentage of women serving on that state's boards and commissions. Of the states responding to that inquiry (approximately 25 at the writing of this report), 14 reported figures which were useful for comparison with our data. The comparison reveals striking similarity in the results.

Representation of Women on Boards and Commissions

The average proportion of women on a board or commission is 15%. That is, on the average, fewer than one-seventh of the positions on a particular state board or commission are filled by women. (For an explanation of how this proportion is

calculated, see Technical Note B.) A majority (53%) of the boards and commissions studied have no women at all.

Variations among the States

States and regions differ by no more than a few percentage points from the general average representation of women on appointive bodies. Among the 39 states for which data are reported, Table 1 reveals a range of average proportions from a low of 8% in Mississippi to a high of 23% in Iowa, Arizona, Hawaii and Washington. An examination of regional variations, as reported in Table 2, reinforces a picture of little difference by geographic locale. The average proportions of women on boards and commissions range from 12% in the Middle Atlantic and West South Central regions to 17% among the West North Central and Mountain states.

The size of a state's population (though not its population density) has some bearing on the appointment of women to boards and commissions. States with smaller populations tend to have higher average proportions of women on state boards and commissions. This relationship, though statistically significant,[8] is fairly low in magnitude[9] (see Technical Note C). There are numerous exceptions to this general tendency. For example, examination of Table 3 reveals that Wyoming, North Dakota, Idaho and New Hampshire do not have high proportions of women on appointive bodies even though their populations are relatively small.

Political Climate of the State

Which of the political parties controls the state executive appears to have little or no impact on the appointment of women to state boards and commissions. On the average, states with Democratic governors and those with Republican governors have the same representation of women (15%) on appointive bodies. Furthermore, as Table 4 indicates, the average proportion of women appointed is not affected by partisan domination of the state executive over the past twenty-five years. States in which one party has occupied the governor's office through the years are no more likely, and no less likely, to advance the role of women on boards and commissions.

Participation of Women in State Legislatures and in State Cabinet Positions.

There is some correspondence between the proportion of legislative offices filled by women and the representation of women on state boards and commissions. Nevertheless, the data suggest that the processes determining the proportion of women in these two areas of public life are to some degree distinct. States with a higher proportion of women among elected officials are somewhat more likely to have a higher average proportion of women in appointive office. However, since the *r* correlation is only +.4 on a scale from 0 to +1.0 (see Technical Note C), we cannot conclude that the appointment of women to boards and commissions is essentially the same phenomenon as election to office, or that the participation of women in one type of office is heavily dependent upon the representation of women in the other. For example, the average proportion of women appointed to

boards and commissions in New Hampshire is one of the lowest (10%) among the states studied, despite the fact that New Hampshire has the highest percentage of women in its state legislature (24%) of all the states (see Table 5).

Within the executive branch of state government, the presence or absence of women in cabinet level positions does not lead to increased proportions of women on boards and commissions. In these states with no women in the state executive at cabinet level or above, the average proportion of women serving on a board or commission is 15.3%. In those with at least one woman in higher executive positions, the average proportion is 14.8%.

In summary, we find that variations in the characteristics of states--their population, regional location, political climate, and the participation of women in other state offices--supply few clues to the low proportions of women found on state boards and commissions. States and regions vary little from the general average. The variation in proportions relates moderately to those states with small populations and those with a high proportion of women in the state legislature.

We turn now to examine the extent to which characteristics of the board or commission relate to the proportion of women appointed. Specifically, we ask whether the size of a board or commission relates to the proportion of women appointed and whether women are more likely to be found within certain functional areas.

Proportions of Women in Functional Areas

In some functional areas, women are almost totally absent. Table 6 shows women concentrated in greatest proportions on those boards and commissions concerned with the welfare of children, youth or aged (average proportion of 35%), health (average proportion of 20%) and education (average proportion of 18%). Fewest women are found in the areas of labor, public utilities, environmental protection, business regulation, transportation, and economic and industrial development.

The high concentrations of women in health, education and welfare, the traditional domains of those few women who have entered public life, are consistent with past research on elected officials and with our initial predictions regarding probable areas of concentration of women on boards and commissions. Whether this uneven spread of women in governmental service is linked to the backgrounds and preferences of women, or whether it is traceable to sex-role stereotyping among those responsible for making appointments cannot be determined within the scope of this research. Indirect evidence suggests that some combination of both processes operate to produce the current distribution of women on boards and commissions.

The impact of the different occupational backgrounds of men and women is highlighted in a more detailed examination of the proportions of women on professional and occupational licensing boards. The average proportion of 16% for this functional area obscures the enormous variation that is manifest when specific

occupations are compared. As is apparent from Table 7, women have high representation on those boards representing traditionally female occupations: nursing, cosmetology and physical therapy. They are nearly absent from boards dealing with occupations dominated by males: medicine, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy and veterinary medicine.

As can be seen from an inspection of the totals in Table 8, the majority of boards and commissions in our study are relatively small, with 6 or fewer members. These smaller boards are also the least likely to contain women among their membership, also shown in Table 8. A majority of boards having seven or more members contain at least one woman. Smaller boards show a striking reverse: women are absent from well over half (60%) of 6 member boards, and over three-quarters (78%) of 3 member boards have no women at all.

This variation in the representation of women by the size of the board or commission is also apparent in the average proportion of women on small and large boards: 3 member boards average 12% women, while 7 member boards average 18%, and finally boards with 25 or more members average 29% female membership.

Women are disproportionately concentrated on the larger bodies because the functional areas of government to which they are appointed contain the larger boards and commissions.[10] Table 9 shows that from one-quarter to nearly one-third of the boards and commissions in health, education and welfare have 15 or more

members. No other functional area among those studied even approaches this high proportion of larger boards. The question presents itself for further research of whether these larger boards, because of their very size, are as likely as smaller boards to have decision-making functions, or whether the larger boards are more often merely honorific or advisory. If larger boards have less decision-making power, then the concentration of women on such boards means that their share of influence in government through boards and commissions is even less than implied by their low percentage of representation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our inquiry into the appointment of women to state boards and commissions invites two broad conclusions:

1. The current representation of women on state boards and commissions is inconsistent with goals of equal participation of women and men in public life.

The average board or commission contains only 15% women, a proportion which tends to be slightly lower in the more populous states but which does not vary greatly by state or region of the country. A majority of boards and commissions contain no women at all. Those women who do serve are concentrated in a few areas of government and on the larger bodies which, in view of their large size, may be disproportionately honorific or advisory, rather than decision-making, in

their functions.

2. Under present conditions, a notable increase in the proportions of women on boards and commissions will require a direct focus on the appointive process and will not come about as a simple byproduct of increasing the representation of women in elective offices, of increasing the numbers of women in higher levels of the state executive, or of the installation of one political party rather than another in the state executive.

Our research findings indicate that there is at best a moderate association between the proportion of women in a state legislature and the average proportion of women on the state's boards and commissions. The representation of women on boards and commissions is unrelated to the presence of women at the cabinet level and to the political party of the governor. Thus it would appear that remedy of the deficiency of women on boards and commissions demands action that specifically addresses this problem. The recommendations to follow are offered in the context of this conclusion.

Recommendations for Action

1. Governors should set as an announced and proximate goal significant increases in proportions of women serving on state boards and commissions.

a. Concerted efforts should be directed toward those areas of activity currently involving the lowest proportions of women.

b. Special attention should be paid to increasing the proportions of women on boards and commissions with small memberships.

2. All states should have available a current, accurate and centralized list of state boards and commissions and their memberships.

a. This listing should be easily and publicly available at cost to any interested person or organization.

b. The currency of the list should be maintained by the appointments staff of the governor's office and regularly monitored regarding the appointment of women.

3. Governors and other governmental executives should designate an officer in the appointments staff to be responsible for seeking qualified women for appointment.

4. Special efforts should be made to insure that women state officials are informed of the low proportion of women on state boards and commissions, are informed of openings, and are urged to suggest and nominate candidates.

5. State governments should develop and maintain talent banks of women qualified to serve on state boards and commissions by:

a. encouraging all interested women to submit resumes

b. requesting State Commissions on the Status of Women to

develop state-wide networks for identifying candidates for appointment.

6. Executive offices should publish and distribute lists of openings on boards and commissions on a regular basis. Commissions on the Status of Women should supplement this activity for all women's groups with a similar regular publication.

7. Foundations and appropriate governmental funding agencies should support efforts to study and document the nature of appointive processes and procedures. To facilitate equal representation of women on boards and commissions, more knowledge of these processes and procedures and the dissemination of such knowledge inside and outside of government is needed. Some research questions to be answered are:

a. To what extent do recommendations for vacancies come from other boards members, resulting in a situation where appointments effectively are made by self-perpetuating boards and not by the state executive?

b. Which, if any, kinds of boards and commissions memberships require special training or qualifications?

c. Which specialized boards have public members?

d. To what extent is political screening done in the appointive process? How important to appointment are party affiliation and activity?

e. Why are the few women on boards and commissions concentrated in just a few governmental areas and on boards with small memberships?

If an increase in the proportions of women on state boards and commissions is to occur, a number of broad conditions must be met. In their most simplified form, these are: the knowledgeability of those responsible for appointments regarding vacancies and the availability of qualified candidates, the knowledgeability of candidates and sponsoring individuals or groups regarding vacancies and the process by which appointments are made, the willingness of women to serve and the willingness of "gatekeepers" to appoint more women.

Major effort must be directed toward fulfilling the conditions of knowledgeability described above. Difficulties of articulation between vacancies and qualified women are enormously increased when there is widespread ignorance of the appointments process both inside and outside of government, when a centralized list of boards and commissions may not exist, when no list of memberships and vacancies is maintained and made available, or when no central repository exists to identify candidates for appointment. Therefore, our recommendations are aimed especially at steps that may be taken to remove the informational vacuum currently surrounding appointive office.

The statement is occasionally made that women are not serving in public positions through lack of desire rather than through lack of opportunity, though no systematic evidence for this assertion has been forthcoming, and there is no reason to suppose that women more often than men refuse appointments that are offered. If women

have not been asked to accept appointments, they are hardly in a position to turn them down. Therefore, a test of the willingness of women to serve can occur only when those responsible for making appointments have made serious efforts to identify qualified women candidates and to offer them positions commensurate with their qualifications.

FOOTNOTES

1. Regions are as defined by: U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970 Census of Population: Characteristics of the Population, Vol. 1, part 1 (Washington, D.C.: Bureau of the Census) p. 48.

2. Ibid., p. 52.

3. U.S. Department of Commerce, 1970 Census Users' Guide, part 1 (Washington, D.C. : Bureau of the Census) p. 77.

4. Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., The World Almanac, 1975 (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1975) p. 48.

5. Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., The World Almanac, 1951 (New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1951) p. 72. (The World Almanac from 1951 to 1975 was used for this compilation.)

6. National Women's Education Fund, "Women State Legislators, 1975," Washington, D.C., 1975. (Mimeograph.)

7. Center for the American Woman and Politics, Women in Public Office: A Biographical Directory and Statistical Analysis (New York: R.R. Bowker, Forthcoming).

8. $p = .05$. See Technical Note C

9. $r = -.31$. See Technical Note C

10. The size of a board or commission does not affect the proportion of women appointed to it independently of the connection between size of board and functional area of government. When the relation of size of board to the average proportion of women members is observed with functional area controlled, there is little or no tendency within a functional area for women to be concentrated on the larger boards.

TECHNICAL NOTE A. Bibliography of Sources on State Boards and Commissions

ALASKA

Governor, Office of the. Boards and Commissions, State of Alaska. (Juneau, Alaska: Office of the Governor) October 1975.

ARIZONA

Turnbow, Mrs. Bill (ed.) Bill Turnbow's 1975-76 Arizona Political Almanac. (Arizona: Sims Printing Co.) 1975.

ARKANSAS

Arkansas Legislative Council. Staff Report No. 75-17: Occupational Licensing Boards. (Little Rock, Arkansas: Legislative Council) October 16, 1975.

Heritage Publishing Company. Arkansas State Directory. (North Little Rock, Arkansas: Heritage Publishing Co.) 1975-76 edition.

CALIFORNIA

Governor, Office of the. Governor's Appointments to Boards and Commissions. (Sacramento, California: Office of the Governor) 1974-75.

CONNECTICUT

State, Secretary of the. State of Connecticut Register and Manual 1975. (Hartford, Connecticut: Office of the Secretary of the State) 1975.

DELAWARE

State, Secretary of. Delaware State Manual 1973-74. (Dover, Delaware: Office of the Secretary of State) 1973-74.

FLORIDA

State, Department of. Elections Division. Directory of Florida Government 1975. (Tallahassee, Florida: Department of State) 1975.

GEORGIA

State, Secretary of. Manual of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia. (Atlanta, Georgia: Secretary of State) February 1975.

State, Secretary of. "Boards and Commissions Not Listed in Legislative Manual." Atlanta, Georgia, December 1975 (mimeographed.)

HAWAII

Special list made available through the courtesy of Jon T. Okudara, Legislative Reference Bureau, Honolulu, Hawaii, November 1975.

IDAHO

State, Secretary of. Idaho Blue Book. (Boise, Idaho: State of Idaho) 1973-74.

ILLINOIS

Special list made available through the courtesy of Judith P. Reid, Assistant Legislative Research Librarian, Illinois State Library, Springfield, Illinois, November 1975 and Mike Goetz, Office of the Governor, Springfield, Illinois, December 1975.

INDIANA

Accounts, State Board of. Statistical Department. Roster of State and Local Officials of the State of Indiana 1975. (Indianapolis, Indiana: State Board of Accounts) 1975.

IOWA

Special list made available through the courtesy of Betty Surls, Office of the governor, Des Moines, Iowa, March 1975.

KANSAS

State, Secretary of. Kansas Directory 1975. (Topeka, Kansas: Secretary of State) 1975.

LOUISIANA

Special list made available through the courtesy of the Secretary of State's Office, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, November 1975.

MAINE

Tower Publishing Company. Maine Register 1974-75. (Portland, Maine: Tower Publishing Co.) 1974.

MARYLAND

Hall of Records Commission. Maryland Manual, 1973-74. (Baltimore, Maryland: Garamond/Pridemark Press, Inc.) 1974.

Hall of Records Commission. Maryland Manual Supplement 1975-1976. (Baltimore, Maryland: The John D. Lucas Printing Co.) 1975.

MICHIGAN

Management and Budget, Department of. Records and Publications Center. Elective and Appointive State Officers 1975-1976. (Lansing, Michigan: Department of Management and Budget) 1975-76.

MISSISSIPPI

State, Secretary of. Mississippi Official and Statistical Register 1972-1976. (Jackson, Mississippi: Secretary of State) 1972.

NEBRASKA

Nebraska Legislative Council. Nebraska Blue Book 1974-75. (Lincoln, Nebraska: Joe Christensen Inc.) 1974-75.

Nevada

Special list made available through the courtesy of Mary Lou Love, Legislative Council Bureau, Carson City, Nevada, December 1975.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Tower Publishing Company. New Hampshire Register 1975-1976. (Portland, Maine: Tower Publishing Co.) 1975.

NEW JERSEY

State, Office of Secretary of. State of New Jersey Official Directory. (Trenton, New Jersey: Secretary of State) 1975.

NEW YORK

Williams Press Inc. (ed.) The New York Red Book 1974. (Albany, New York: Williams Press Inc.) 1974.

NORTH CAROLINA

Special list made available through the courtesy of the Office of the Secretary of the State, Raleigh, North Carolina, December 1975.

NORTH DAKOTA

State, Secretary of. Directory, State of North Dakota, Officials, Boards, Institutions. (Bismarck, North Dakota: Secretary of State) 1975.

OHIO

Special list made available through the courtesy of Miss Jerry Patton, Office of the Secretary of State, Columbus, Ohio, December 1975.

OKLAHOMA

State Election Board. Directory of Oklahoma 1975. (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: State Election Board) 1975.

OREGON

State, Secretary of. Oregon Blue Book 1975-1976. (Salem, Oregon: Secretary of State) 1975.

RHODE ISLAND

State, Secretary of. The State of Rhode Island Manual 1973-1974. (Providence, Rhode Island: Secretary of State) 1973-74.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Orange, Sylvia W., Clerk of House of Representatives. 1975 South Carolina Legislative Manual. (Columbia, South Carolina : House of Representatives) 1975.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Special list made available through the courtesy of Steven Davis, Office of the Governor, Pierre, South Dakota, December 1975.

TEXAS

Dallas Morning News, The. Texas Almanac and State Industrial Guide 1974-1975. (Dallas, Texas: A.H. Belo Corporation) 1973.

UTAH

Finance, Department of. Utah Official Roster 1973-75. (Salt Lake City, Utah: Department of Finance) 1974.

VERMONT

Special list made available through the courtesy of Jean Mayer, Office of the Governor, Montpelier, Vermont, December 1975.

VIRGINIA

Commonwealth, Secretary of the. Report of the Secretary of the Commonwealth 1973-74. (Richmond, Virginia: Office of the Secretary of the Commonwealth 1973-74.

WASHINGTON

Special list made available through the courtesy of Sharon Chandler, Office of the Governor, Olympia, Washington, December 1975.

WEST VIRGINIA

Carson, Howard W., Clerk of the Senate. West Virginia Blue Book 1974. (Charleston, West Virginia: Jarrett Printing Company) 1974.

WYOMING

State, Secretary of. 1975 Wyoming Official Directory. (Cheyenne, Wyoming: Secretary of State) 1975.

TECHNICAL NOTE B. Calculating an Average Proportion

The average proportion of 15% is obtained by (1) computing the percentage of women on each board, (2) summing the resulting percentages, (3) dividing this sum by the total number of boards. Average percentages for each state have been obtained in the same manner as have all other figures labeled as average or mean proportions. This procedure prevents larger boards from contributing undue weight to the general average. An overall proportion of 17% is obtained by counting the total number of women serving on boards and commissions in all the states and by dividing this total by the total number of members, male and female combined. However, this latter procedure gives disproportionate weight to larger boards and commissions.

TECHNICAL NOTE C. Correlation and Statistical Significance

The Pearsonian correlation, *r*, is a measure used to describe the extent to which a difference in quantity of one phenomenon or event (e.g., state population) is accompanied by a commensurate difference in quantity of some other event (e.g., average proportion of women on boards and commissions). Correlation is indicated as a point on a scale from -1.0, through 0, to +1.0, with zero indicating no association and the positive and negative extremes indicating perfect association. A negative sign preceding *r* indicates that as one factor increases in quantity, the other decreases (e.g., as state population increases, the proportion of women on boards decreases). A positive sign indicates that both events increase or decrease together (e.g., as the proportion of women in the legislature rises, the proportion of women on state boards also rises).

In the context of reporting measures of correlation, a reference to statistical significance as p = (some fraction of 100) expresses the average number of times out of 100 repetitions of the research that the pattern found (i.e., the correlation as measured by *r*) in the research data would occur if, in reality, there were only random connections between events.

Table 1. Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions (in Ten Governmental Areas), Total and by State

States by Region	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
New England		
Maine	15	(34)
Vermont	18	(55)
New Hampshire	10	(46)
Massachusetts	--[b]	--[b]
Connecticut	18	(55)
Rhode Island	17	(59)
Middle Atlantic		
New York	11	(50)
New Jersey	12	(64)
Pennsylvania	--[b]	--[b]
East North Central		
Wisconsin	--[b]	--[b]
Illinois	15	(43)
Indiana	11	(64)
Michigan	16	(63)
Ohio	11	(54)
West North Central		
Minnesota	--[b]	--[b]
Iowa	23	(75)
Missouri	--[b]	--[b]
North Dakota	14	(40)
South Dakota	20	(54)
Nebraska	13	(55)
Kansas	14	(49)
South Atlantic		
Delaware	17	(46)
Maryland	14	(54)
West Virginia	13	(47)
Virginia	13	(60)
North Carolina	12	(49)
South Carolina	14	(53)
Georgia	14	(62)
Florida	13	(38)

(continued)

Table 1 (continued). Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions (in Ten Governmental Areas), Total and by State

States by Region	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
East South Central		
Kentucky	--[b]	--[b]
Tennessee	--[b]	--[b]
Alabama	--[b]	--[b]
Mississippi	8	(50)
West South Central		
Arkansas	11	(50)
Oklahoma	15	(72)
Louisiana	11	(65)
Texas	11	(74)
Mountain		
Montana	--[b]	--[b]
Idaho	14	(50)
Wyoming	12	(47)
Nevada	20	(64)
Utah	16	(60)
Colorado	--[b]	--[b]
Arizona	23	(46)
New Mexico	--[b]	--[b]
Pacific		
Washington	23	(58)
Oregon	19	(61)
California	13	(79)
Alaska	18	(43)
Hawaii	23	(46)
TOTAL	15	(2134)

[a] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.

[b] Information not available.

Table 2. Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions by Region

Region[a]	Average Proportion of Women[b]	Number of Boards
New England	16	(249)
Middle Atlantic	12	(114)
East North Central	13	(224)
West North Central	17	(273)
South Atlantic	14	(409)
East South Central	--[c]	--[c]
West South Central	12	(261)
Mountain	17	(267)
Pacific	16	(287)
TOTAL	15	(2084)

[a] For a listing of states within each region, see Table 1.

[b] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.

[c] Excluded because data are available from only one state (Mississippi) in this region.

Table 3. Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions, Ordered by the 1970 Population of the States.

State	1970 Population (in ten thousands, ordered from high to low)	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
Alaska	30	18	(43)
Wyoming	33	12	(47)
Vermont	44	18	(55)
Nevada	49	20	(64)
Delaware	55	17	(46)
North Dakota	62	14	(40)
South Dakota	66	20	(54)
Montana	69	--[b]	--[b]
Idaho	71	14	(50)
New Hampshire	74	10	(46)
Hawaii	77	23	(46)
Rhode Island	95	17	(59)
Maine	99	15	(34)
New Mexico	102	--[b]	--[b]
Utah	106	16	(60)
Nebraska	148	13	(55)
West Virginia	174	13	(47)
Arizona	177	23	(46)
Arkansas	192	11	(50)
Oregon	209	19	(61)
Colorado	220	--[b]	--[b]
Mississippi	222	8	(50)
Kansas	225	14	(49)
Oklahoma	256	15	(72)
South Carolina	259	14	(53)
Iowa	282	23	(75)
Connecticut	303	18	(55)
Kentucky	322	--[b]	--[b]
Washington	341	23	(58)
Alabama	344	--[b]	--[b]
Louisiana	364	11	(65)
Minnesota	380	--[b]	--[b]
Maryland	392	14	(54)
Tennessee	392	--[b]	--[b]
Wisconsin	442	--[b]	--[b]
Georgia	459	14	(62)
Virginia	465	13	(60)
Missouri	468	--[b]	--[b]
North Carolina	508	12	(49)
Indiana	519	16	(64)

(continued)

Table 3 (continued). Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions, Ordered by the 1970 Population of the States.

State	1970 Population (in ten thousands, ordered from high to low)	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
Massachusetts	569	--[b]	--[b]
Florida	679	13	(38)
New Jersey	717	12	(64)
Michigan	888	16	(63)
Ohio	1065	11	(54)
Illinois	1111	15	(43)
Texas	1120	11	(74)
Pennsylvania	1179	--[b]	--[b]
New York	1824	11	(50)
California	1995	13	(79)
TOTAL		15	(2134)

[a] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.

[b] Information not available.

Table 4. Average Proportion of Women on Boards and Commissions, by Total Years Governorship Held by One Party, 1951-1975.

Total Years Governorship Held by One Party, 1951-1975	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of States
20 to 25 years Democratic	12	(8)
20 to 25 years Republican	15	(3)
15 to 19 years Democratic	17	(9)
15 to 19 years Republican	16	(8)
10 to 14 years Democratic	15	(9)
10 to 14 years Republican	15	(13)

[a] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.

Table 5. Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions, Ordered by Percentage of Women in State Legislatures, 1975.

State	Percentage of Women in State Legislature	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
New Hampshire	24	10	(46)
Arizona	20	23	(46)
Colorado	16	--[b]	--[b]
Delaware	16	17	(46)
Alaska	15	18	(43)
Connecticut	14	18	(55)
Hawaii	13	23	(46)
Maine	13	15	(34)
Nevada	12	20	(64)
Oregon	12	19	(61)
Vermont	12	18	(55)
Washington	12	23	(58)
Idaho	10	14	(50)
Maryland	10	14	(54)
North Dakota	10	14	(40)
South Dakota	10	20	(54)
Iowa	9	23	(75)
Montana	9	--[b]	--[b]
North Carolina	9	12	(49)
Florida	8	13	(38)
New Jersey	8	12	(64)
Utah	8	16	(60)
Wisconsin	8	--[b]	--[b]
Wyoming	8	12	(47)
Ohio	7	11	(54)
West Virginia	7	13	(47)
Illinois	6	15	(43)
Indiana	6	16	(64)
Massachusetts	6	--[b]	--[b]
Michigan	6	16	(63)
Missouri	6	--[b]	--[b]
Rhode Island	6	17	(59)
Kansas	5	14	(49)
Georgia	4	14	(62)
Kentucky	4	--[b]	--[b]
Minnesota	4	--[b]	--[b]
New Mexico	4	--[b]	--[b]
New York	4	11	(50)
Oklahoma	4	15	(72)
Pennsylvania	4	--[b]	--[b]

(continued)

Table 5 (continued). Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions, Ordered by Percentage of Women in State Legislatures, 1975.

State	Percentage of Women in State Legislature	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
South Carolina	4	14	(53)
Tennessee	4	--[b]	--[b]
Texas	4	11	(74)
Virginia	4	13	(60)
Mississippi	3	8	(50)
Arkansas	2	11	(50)
California	2	13	(79)
Nebraska	2	13	(55)
Alabama	1	--[b]	--[b]
Louisiana	1	11	(65)
TOTAL		15	(2134)

[a] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.

[b] Information not available.

Table 6. Average Proportion of Women on State Boards and Commissions by Functional Area

Functional Area	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
Welfare of Children, Youth, Aged	35	(89)
Health	20	(282)
Education	18	(225)
Professional and Occupational Licensing	16	(934)
Labor	11	(158)
Public Utilities	8	(19)
Environmental Protection	7	(129)
Business Regulation	7	(146)
Economic and Industrial Development	6	(55)
Transportation	4	(94)
TOTAL	15	(2131)[b]

[a] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.

[b] Functional areas could not be coded for 3 boards.

Table 7. Average Proportion of Women Serving on Selected Professional and Occupational Licensing Boards

Professional and Occupational Licensing Board	Average Proportion of Women[a]	Number of Boards
Nursing Examiners	93	(36)
Cosmetology	75	(28)
Physical Therapist Examiners	46	(30)
Nursing Home Administrators	30	(27)
Psychologist Examiners	16	(35)
Hearing Aid Dealers and Fitters	11	(26)
Chiropractic Examiners	10	(33)
Pharmacy	6	(38)
Accountancy	5	(37)
Barber Examiners	4	(37)
Medical Examiners	4	(33)
Podiatrist Examiners	4	(30)
Optometric Examiners	3	(37)
Architects, Engineers, Land Surveyors	2	(37)
Dental Examiners	2	(36)
Funeral Directors and Embalmers	1	(34)
Veterinary Examiners	1	(39)
TOTAL	16	(573)[b]

[a] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.

[b] Includes only those professional and occupational licensing boards found in most states.

Table 8. Percentage of Boards and Commissions with Female Membership by Size of Board

Female Membership	Number of Members on Board or Commission									
	3 %	4 %	5 %	6 %	7 %	8 %	9 %	10-14 %	15-24 %	25+ %
No Women	78	70	67	60	40	48	35	28	11	2
At least 1 Woman	22	30	33	40	60	52	65	72	89	98
TOTAL BOARDS[a]	(318)	(135)	(467)	(220)	(244)	(110)	(133)	(242)	(155)	(57)

[a] Boards and commissions (53) having fewer than 3 appointed members have been eliminated from the tabulation.

Table 9. Size of Membership of State Boards and Commissions by Functional Area (in percent)

	Functional Areas									
	Education %	Environmental %	Health %	Welfare %	Prof. & Occ. Bd. %	Public Utilities %	Transportation %	Econ. Development %	Labor %	Business Regulation %
Number of Members										
1 - 6	25	46	22	27	65	90	60	36	51	77
7 - 14	49	49	49	42	24	10	35	50	32	23
15 or more	26	5	29	31	1	0	5	14	17	0
TOTAL BOARDS[a]	(225)	(129)	(282)	(89)	(934)	(19)	(94)	(55)	(158)	(146)
Average Proportion Women Members[b]	18	7	20	35	16	8	4	6	11	7

[a] Functional areas could not be coded for 3 boards.

[b] For an explanation of how this proportion is calculated, see Technical Note B.